

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

The comments made on page 5, second full paragraph of the Official action have been noted, and accordingly, previous claim 1 has been replaced by new independent claims 39, 41 and 56 which reflect structure for achieving the described advantage.

Claim 39 recites that the distributor is located within the inner volume of the vessel and has a radius substantially equal to the bending radius of the coil bundle. As noted in the prior amendment, that arrangement means that the distributor does not disturb a flow in the central part of the coil.

Claim 41 is similar to claim 39 but recites that the manifold is located within the inner volume of the vessel and has a radius substantially equal to the bending radius of the coil bundle. The resulting advantage is the same as noted above.

Claim 56 recites first and second bundles of different respective radii, and a distributor and a manifold. Each of the distributor and manifold is recited as being located in inner volume of the vessel and having a radius substantially equal to the radius of one of the first and second coil bundles. Again, the same advantage described above will result.

In light of the foregoing amendments and comments, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: March 31, 2008

By:



Alan E. Kopecki
Registration No. 25813

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620